



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS LXXVI (1920), Heft 3/4.

Pp. 240-265. A. Gudeman, Die syrisch-arabische Uebersetzung der aristotelischen Poetik. The Arabic translation of the Poetics found in a Parisian ms. (882 A) of the tenth or eleventh century has long been known to orientalists but its dreadful condition has made scholars loath to use it through translation for a recension of the Greek text. In 1872 Sachau copied it and made a literal German translation for Vahlen who cited it but once. In 1887 the Oxford Arabist, D. Margoliouth, published the Arabic text in his *Analecta Orientalia ad Poeticam Aristoteleam* and added (pp. 46-72) *Symbolae orientales ad emendationem poetices*, which offered about 30 noteworthy readings, some new, others confirming the conjectures of modern scholars. Not until Margoliouth's edition of the Poetics (1911) was a complete translation from the Arabic available. Dr. Gudeman, who is preparing a critical and exegetical commentary on the Poetics, by applying as a test the transcription of the proper names, made the important discovery that the Greek original was a majuscule ms. in scriptura continua and so must have belonged at the latest to the fifth or sixth century. It is therefore *a priori* probable that such a codex would offer a text of no little value. By making use of Sachau's German and Margoliouth's Latin versions, together with the paraphrase of Averroes and the Poetica of Avicenna (both of whom used a better manuscript than that at Paris), Dr. Gudeman has found over 400 important readings which can be ascribed to the Greek original. One hundred and fifty passages confirm conjectures of modern scholars; more than 100 agree with one or another ms. and have preserved the correct reading; 170 offer new readings which are for the most part improvements on the vulgate and which, in any case, are noteworthy variants. The reconstructed Greek majuscule must from now on be rated in the very first rank as a source for the text. To illustrate the value of the readings the writer discusses 36 passages.

Pp. 266-292. R. Asmus, Kaiser Julians Misopogon und seine Quelle. Part I. Not only the underlying thought but, in part, also the structure of the peculiar work are to be gathered from Julian's sixth oration against the Cynics (p. 244, 15 Hertlein), in which he calls them false disciples of Diogenes and points out to them that in self-knowledge lies the essential position of Cynicism and philosophy. In support of this the emperor appeals to the Alcibiades I ascribed to Plato. The

dependence of the Misopogon on the Alcibiades I is shown by parallel passages. The Misopogon is divided into an introduction and three parts, each containing three divisions, the last of which is separated from the first two by a picture-like insert. The first part describes the emperor's opinion of his own appearance and mode of life and contrasts the ways of the Antiochenes. The second part tells of what he offers to, and withholds from, them in his external intercourse. The third part explains why Julian and the Antiochenes have quarreled; he needs to learn self-knowledge and study how to adapt himself. (To be concluded.)

Pp. 293-331. L. Gurlitt, Tulliana. Critical notes. I. Epistulae ad Atticum. V 4, 1. The letter refers to the projected marriage of Tullia. Read: ac ne illud quidem laboro . . . adduci ut nostrae (i. e. Tulliae) possit et tuis . . . res habebit mirationem. V 11, 6. Read: Tu praefectis excusationes, quas voles, deferto. V 11, 7. Read: Nam illam *μοναρχίαν* (sc. Caesaris) excusationem ne acceperis. VII 7, 1. For *putato* read *perusitatum*. VIII 11, 4. Read: aestate (aut alterius) aut utriusque imman(ibus) copiis. X 12a, 4(7). Read: modo aliquid *ἥθος ἀκριβολόγον*. X 13, 3. Read: habes *κέλητα ἄοκνον*. X 17, 1. Read: vellem *κέλητα* eius . . . cumulativissime *κέλητα*. XI 6, 2. Read: quos (i. e. lictores) ego Non. (i. e. Nov. 5) paulisper . . . in turbam conieci . . . ne quis . . . fieret; recipio: tempore me domi tenere ad oppidum et quonam iis placeret modo propius accedere, ut hac de re considerarent. *Recipio* is a juristic term; *tempore* = at the right time, i. e. by day. Also punctuate: me non angeret Brundisi iacere; also read: in omnibus portibus. XI 9, 1. Read: a. d. III Non. Ian. XI 14, 3. Read: Te a. d. V Idus tamen exspecto, quem videre, si ullo modo potes venire, pervelim. . . . Ibi facile est (quid?) quale sit illius *γραφαῖς* (?) existimare. XI 17a, 1 (= 17, 1). Read: Itaque *ἡματιαν* (i. e. by day); for proea read: prid. or pr. Id. The second letter began: Quod ad modum consolantis scripsisti P(omponiam?) tantum de me scripsisse, (respondeas ei quaeso) quae tu ipse intelligis responderi posse (or perhaps even better: quae tu ipse intelligis responderi posse respondeas.) XI 7, 6. Read: T(ulliam) flagitare, for te f. XI 7, 5. Read: Sed totum *ἥθος* Balbus sustinet. XI 23, 3. Read: audimus enim testaturi eludi: generum, ne nostrum potissimum *ἥθος* (sc. sequeretur or sequi videretur), vel tabulas novas (sc. promulgare). XII 44, 3. Read: solet omnino (sc. Philotimus) esse *φιλομαθής*. XIII 19, 5. Read: eiusque partes. XIII 25, 3 fin. Read: si umquam quicquam tam *ἐν παρέργῳ*. Ne Tironi quidem. XIII 40, 2. Read: ad quem, ut audio, pater hodie. *ἀπάξεται ἀφρονοῦντα*. XIII 41, 1. Read: significavi me Non. fore. August 5 was foreseen as the day of young Cicero's home-coming. XIII 42, 3. Read: eatur

μία ἐξόδος (or μῶς ἐξόδον?). On p. 330, note 20, K. Rupprecht suggests as better: eatur. μῶς ἐξόδον videbimus te igitur. XIV 14, 1. Read: de αἰρέσει . . . et de Φαίάκων more. XV 4, 1. Read: Ad recentiorem prius et leniorem. Laudo! . . . cui quidem ista credo. Punctuate: spectare videtur. Siquidem . . . eripitur, etc . . . rides. XV 15, 1. For *id* read ἰδ' = 14 = quater decies centena milia sestertium. XV 17, 1. Read: ego de itinere nisi explicato (sc. sestertio) λ' nihil cogito. II. Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem. I 2, 13. The text needs no change. Between the two Greek quotations the *et* might be replaced by a dash. II 3, 5. For *ista ei* read Stati(um). II 5, 1 (= 4, 3). For *autem* read αὐθαίμ(ονος). II 9(8), 2. Read: sicut εἰδέναι ἃ ἐξήσας, numquam enim dicam ἐδρασας. II 9, 3. Read: non ἀλύπῃτοι, sed ἀτάρακτοι (ira?). II 14, 1. Tucker's ἀναπληρώσεις is right. III 1, 7. Read ὅψει for *quasi*; also: nihil te recordari de sc. (i. e. senatus consulto), de epistulis, etc.

Pp. 331-348. H. Blümner, Kritisch-exegetische Bemerkungen zu Petrons Cena Trimalchionis. C. 27, 4, read: et quidem iam *principem* cenae videtis. C. 29, 5 read: quorum *imam* partem. Translate sub eodem titulo "with the same inscription." C. 35, 3 f.: *oclopetam* should perhaps be *octopoda*. Plin. N. H. IX 84 says: Lolligo etiam volitat extra aquam se efferens . . . sagittae modo. But the lolligo sagittata has the shape of an arrow and a fringe like arrow-feathers. This fact would explain why it might be put under the sign of Sagittarius. C. 39, 5: for *colei* read *consules*. C. 43, 4: translate *involavit* "pocketed" not "stole" as in C. 58, 10. C. 44, 6 ff.: read *ventilabat* for *vel pilabat* for which *tractabat* was a gloss. C. 44, 12. The point of comparison is the fact that a calf's tail is disproportionately large, so that he seems to grow faster backwards. C. 45, 11: read occidit de *placenta* equites. C. 46, 5: read *scit* quidem litteras. C. 58, 8 f.: read *quid de nobis?* three times. As in Greek, so in Latin, this was probably the stock phrase introducing a riddle, although this seems to be a unique example. That *minor* (not *minus*) is found is typical of the freedman's grammar. The answers to the riddles are: the foot; the gnomon on a sun-dial; and the shadow. C. 64, 1: for the sanctity of the dinner-table compare Plut. Quaest. conv. VII 4, 7 p. 704 B. and Aet. Rom. 64 p. 279 E. C. 65, 2: *ova pilleata* may have been hard-boiled eggs served with half the shell removed. C. 69, 6 f.: read mirabor, nisi omnia ista de *cera* facta sunt aut certe de luto.

MISCELLEN.

Pp. 349-351. R. Foerster, Ἑλλάβιον, nicht ἐλλέβορος. The passages cited for ἐλλέβορος go back to a single source, a false

reading in which was taken over by Pollux V 101, Clemens Alex. Paed. II 12 § 124 and Hesychius.

Pp. 351-355. H. Rubenbauer and G. Dittmann, Fulmen = Stütze? The assumption of a word *fulmen* from *fulcio*, as printed in the ninth edition of Heinichen's Schulwörterbuch, is unwarranted. The correct reading of Manilius II 892 is *culmina*.

Pp. 356-359. E. Hoppe, Die Entwicklung des Infinitesimalbegriffs. The concept of the infinitesimal is to be found first, not in Archimedes, but in Plato's Philebus, 17 A-27 D. Its clear development is probably Plato's most substantial achievement in the field of mathematics. Had Democritus had this knowledge, his summation of the many minute prisms inside the pyramid would have been changed to integration, i. e. the infinite summation of the ever changing surfaces. Archimedes completely carries out Plato's idea in his recently (1906) discovered *εφodus*, in which he performs the first integration between finite limits on the segment of a parabola with the ordinates on the axis. It cannot be proved that Archimedes was acquainted with Plato's ideas, but as the quadrature of the parabola was cited previously in a special book, it is quite possible that Archimedes arrived independently at the concept of the infinitesimal. In any case Archimedes and Plato fared alike in that they were not understood by their followers. The only Greek mathematician who has used the *εφodus* is Heron of Alexandria who used propositions 1, 11, and 12 in his Metric.

Pp. 359-362. N. Wecklein, Zur Medea des Euripides. The defective motivation of the Aegeus-scene in the Medea seems to have been censured as early as Aristotle (Poet. 1461 b 19). E. Bethe in his "Medea-probleme" clears the poet of ignorance of the technique of his art, for he makes his ambition to please the Athenians responsible for the blemish. Bethe assumes that the first draft of the Medea did not include the Aegeus-scene but placed the Jason-scene before the Kreon-scene. Wecklein admits that Euripides wished to praise Athens, but declares that it is unnecessary to assume any complete first draft of the play. The third stasimon, 824 ff., and the close of the drama are closely connected with the Aegeus-scene. While working out the play the poet must have decided to make the latter addition in order to make possible the insertion of the Aegeus-scene. The real motive for the murder of the children is revenge on Jason their father. Bethe's assumption of a second motive, fear that the kinsmen of the royal house might slay the children, is to be rejected.

Pp. 312-366. Th. Birt, Zu Marius Maximus. Spartianus

in the life of Geta 2, 1 writes: *de cuius vita et moribus in vita Severi Marius Maximus primo septenario satis copiose scripsit*. Severus was addicted to astrology and fond of the number seven; his very name Septimius suggests it. Marius Maximus unquestionably used the emperor's autobiography. He might have called his work *libri planetarii*, had the word *planetarius* been current; so he called it *libri septenarii*. Birt attempts to apportion the events of Severus' life between two books of seven divisions each.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE.

HERMES LV (1920), 3 and 4.

Zu Philodems Schrift über die Frömmigkeit (225-278). R. Philippon has completed a work that shows that the entire criticism of the gods in antiquity was based on Epicurean criticism, beginning about the second century B. C. The present high cost of printing has induced him to publish the section dealing with the Herculean fragments of Philodemus' *Περὶ εὐσεβείας*, which, as is well known, contains the fullest exposition of the Epicurean criticism; its agreement with Cicero's *De natura deorum* I, Lucian's *Ζεὺς τραγῳδός*, Clemens Alexandrinus' *προτρεπτικός* etc. was first pointed out by J. Dietze, *Fleck. Jbb.* 153 (1896), pp. 218 ff. With the aid of stichometric data, emendations, the *προτρεπτικός* etc., he establishes, as he thinks, a fairly correct sequence of the fragments. Thereupon he presents the emended text, which is based on Gomperz' text (1866) and the Naples collection of fragments, beginning with the introduction and continuing with the criticism of the poets and mythologers. The mythological sources are discussed.

Religionsgeschichtliches in der *Historia Augusta* (279-295). J. Geffcken shows that the passages dealing with religion confirm the observation of historians, that the earlier part of the *Historia Augusta*, which is based on Marius Maximus, is notably freer from forgery than the part lying beyond his time. In the earlier part the vitae deal with religion *sine ira et studio* and show little forgery; but beginning with Severus Alexander, forgery and perversion in the sphere of religion is unmistakable. This emperor, e. g., is said (29, 2) to have had: in *larario suo* . . . Apollonium . . . Christum, Abraham et Orfeum. Such a conglomeration was only possible in the fourth century of our era. Other curious examples of forgery are discussed, which reveal the aim of the learned author to incline his Christian readers to observe a liberal attitude towards the heathen religion; at the same time, in a covert manner, he deals out blows on Christianity.

Über den Ursprung der *Historia Augusta* (296-310). E. Hohl, in full accord with the preceding article of Geffcken, as well as with Dessau (cf. A. J. P. XII 115; see also pp. 379 f.), shows that the author of the *Historia Augusta* was a grammarian, who was associated with the family of Symmachus, the champion of the heathen party towards the close of the fourth century of our era. This aristocratic circle was active in its efforts to revive interest in Roman literature, of which Macrobius gives a vivid picture. That the fictitious scriptores were projected back to the era of Diocletian and Constantine is due to the forger's avoidance of the period when the Christian party predominated.

Hipparchos und Themistocles (311-318). I. K. J. Beloch upholds his view (Gr. G. I² 2 pp. 294 ff.) against E. v. Stern (Hermes LII [1917], pp. 354 ff.) that Hipparchus was the oldest of Peisistratus' sons and was the ruler of Athens when he was assassinated by Harmodius and Aristogiton. He discusses the passages in Thucydides and Herodotus bearing on this question, and especially stresses, as contemporary evidence, the Harmodius song: *ὅτε τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην, ἰσονόμους δ' Ἀθήνας ἐποησάτην*. The murder of a younger brother could not have shaken the stability of the tyrannical government. Thucydides depended on legends, and, being embittered by his banishment, desired to minimize the importance of the popular heroes of the democracy; hence he contaminated two versions: the vulgate, according to which the tyrant Hipparchus was assassinated, and his own version that they had planned to kill the 'tyrant' Hippias. Thucydides' account (VI, 54 ff.; 1, 20, 2) is certainly open to question, for when the conspirators surmised that the plot had been revealed to Hippias, it would have been natural for them to flee.—II. Beloch elucidates his view (Gr. Gesch. II² 2 pp. 134 f.) that Themistocles was not a demagog like Clisthenes or Ephialtes, but belonged to the party of the *γνώριμοι*, like Cimon. Rosenberg (Hermes LIII [1918], 308 f.) mistakenly charges him with describing Themistocles as a reactionary. Beloch further maintains, against R., that the Alcmeonids were responsible for the law (488/7 B. C.) requiring that the archons be elected by lot.

Miscellen: A. Rosenberg (319-321) interprets an inscription from the Turkish village Adanda (Mon. Ant. XXIII 1914), which dedicated a building to the emperor Gallienus *ἐπὶ Ἀ. Ὑποκωνίου Ζήνωνος τοῦ διασημοτάτου ἡγεμόνος ἐπὶ παιδείας* (= a studiis) *τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ*. The title shows that Zeno belonged to the equestrian order, which makes this the third example, in the reign of Gallienus, of a senatorial province governed by an eques (cf. Keyes, *The Rise of the Equites*, Princeton Diss.,

1915). The curator (λογιστής) was a citizen of the place, which adds another exception to the rule. The honorific κτίστης is noteworthy.—Fr. Berdolet (321-323) defends the reading of Palatinus X in Lysias, *περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ* 12: τῷ ἀφανίσαντι . . . τῷ ποιήσαντι against the conjectures <μοι> ἀφανίσαντι . . . <περι> ποιήσαντι (cf. Thalheim, editio maior).—U. Wilcken (324-325) having noticed a change in the writing of lines 4-8 in the subscriptio to the Didymus papyrus, concludes that they were a later addition; hence the original 1-3: Διδύμων περὶ Δημοσθένους κη must mean: 'the twenty-eighth book of Didymus on Demosthenes, and thus he now sides with Leo against Diels, Blass and Wendland. φιλιππικῶν γ, which follows, means that the above book is at the same time the third of those that deal with the Philippics.—O. Weinreich (325) adds to K. Holl's evidence as to the continued existence of the Cappadocian language (cf. A. J. P. XXXII 466) a citation from Xenophon of Ephesos: καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἰππόθοος ἐμπείρως εἶχε τῆς Καππαδοκῶν φωνῆς καὶ αὐτῷ πάντες ὡς οἰκέω προσεφέροντο, but Xenophon's date is uncertain.—O. Weinreich (326-329) adds to the examples of hair-offerings to Helios a passage from Xenophon of Ephesos (V, 11).—E. Hedicke (328-329) emends τῆς to τις in Dionys. of Hal., Arch. Rom., V 70 ἦν δ' ἄρα ἡ κρείττων ἀρχή <τις> κατὰ νόμους τυραννίς, and explains how the senate, when the power of the consuls had been weakened by P. Valerius Publicola's ius de provocazione, created the dictatorship, which with its greater authority is characterized as a kind of legal tyranny.—E. Hedicke (330-334) observes that the misplaced leaves in the text of the archetype of the *στρατηγήματα* of Sex. Julius Frontinus (cf. Hermes VI p. 156) equaled about 110 Teubner lines, which indicates the transposition of a quaternio, not merely of one or two leaves. He illustrates this by means of parallel columns of cod. Harleianus 2666, his revised text and—by way of contrast—Oudendorp's text. He adds some remarks on the various mss., of which Harleianus 2666 appears to be the best, although he has not collated them all.—A. Alt (334-336) criticizes E. Meyer's attempt to derive πύργος, in the sense of an industrial building, from a primitive tower (cf. A. J. P. XLII 345).—Correction of misprints at Hermes LV pp. 187 and 223.

Die Entstehung des sogenannten Foedus Cassianum und des lateinischen Rechts (337-363). A. Rosenberg tries to determine the context of the foedus Cassianum from Cic. pro Balbo 53, Dionys. Hal. Arch. Rom. VI 95, Festus, etc. Dionysius gives only a part of the document, which he must have derived from some careless annalist. He, further, discusses the Latin privilege of voting with the Roman tribus, which must have been included in the above foedus Cassianum; but as the elections of the Roman tribus would have signified little until the lex

Hortensia had been adopted 287 B. C., he concludes that the so-called foedus Cassianum was subsequent to that date and discards the traditional date 493 B. C. (cf. Cic. pro Balbo 53). Moreover, the foedus in question must have preceded the granting of the privileges to the group of twelve Latin colonies, which were modeled after those granted Ariminum 268 B. C. The well-known resemblance of the foedus C. to the Greek *ισοπολιτεία*, the origin of which cannot be traced further back than 300 B. C., leads him to conclude that this institution of a two-fold citizenship, which was contrary to Roman principles, was in fact adopted from the Greeks at the time of Pyrrhus' invasion, when Rome felt the need of bringing about a closer union with the Italian cities.

Zu Philodems Schrift über die Frömmigkeit IV (364-372). R. Philippson continues his discussion of the first book of the *περὶ εὐσεβείας*, which contained the criticism of the philosophers (see above).

Die Hera von Tiryns (373-387). C. Robert examines the evidence on which Frickenhaus (Tiryns. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts in Athen I) bases his hypothesis that the oldest temple and worship of Hera were located at Tiryns (cf. Paus. II 17, 5; Clem. Alex. Protrept. IV 47, 5; Euseb. Praep. Ev. III 8, 1 etc.), and concludes that the evidence proves rather that the original heraeon was at Argos. The large number of clay figures found at Tiryns of girls carrying pigs indicate a sanctuary of Demeter. The question as to what divinity was worshipped in the seventh-century temple at Tiryns remains to be solved. Robert looks forward to Dörpfeld's discussion of the subject.

Honestos (388-426). E. Preuner presents a study of the epigrams of Honestus and their respective monuments, which proceeds along the lines suggested by Dessau (cf. A. J. P. XXXVII 490). The identification of the Julia epigram is corroborated and elucidated in detail. The *Φιλέταυρος Εὐμένον* who dedicated the Thamyris monument was one of the Attalids of Pergamon, third century B. C.; but his identification is still an open question. Whether Thamyris was represented in relief or in the round is uncertain (cf. Paus. IX 30, 2). The epigrams describing the Muses are emended and elucidated, and the character of these monuments considered (cf. Paus. IX 30, 1). The praise of peace in the epigram to *Θάληα* together with the phrase *εἰρήνης διςσὰ φάη* of the Julia epigram point to the Ara Pacis as a terminus post quem. The fact that the dedicatory inscription to the Muses is in the Boeotian dialect, shows that these monuments were erected not later than the early part of the second century B. C., as from this time on the *κοινή*

was in official use. The Honestus epigrams, of course, were added subsequently. Honestus seems to have received the impulse to write his Thespian epigrams from the proximity of this place to Thebes for which he wrote Anth. Pal. IX 216, 250. The monuments of Thebes had formed the basis for the Ἐπιγράμματα Θηβαϊκά of the Aristarchean Aristodemus (cf. Hermes XXXVI, p. 58; A. J. P. XXIII 332). In language and style Kaibel classified Honestus with Antipater and Philippos of Thessalonice and Leonidas of Alexandria (cf. Comment. Mommsen (1877) p. 334). Honestus' Theban epigrams are remarkably similar to Philippos Anth. Pal. IX 253, and the Julia epigram to Thallos, l. c., VII 373. Preuner thinks that Greek was not his native tongue.

Die Fanniusfrage (427-442). F. Münzer emends and elucidates Cicero's letter to Atticus XII 5, 3, with especial regard to the error in Brutus 99 ff. where a C. Fannius C. f., consul and orator, is distinguished from the historian C. Fannius M. f.; whereas the consul-orator was also Marci filius and identical with the historian (cf. Hendrickson A. J. P. XXVII 198).

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.